

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office	
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS	
P.O. Box 1450	
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450	
www.uspto.gov	

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/601,076	06/19/2003	Russell Westerman	074361.00016	7046	Λ
75	90 05/13/2004		EXAMINER] ₩
Harvey S. Kauget			AHMED,	SHAMIM	
Holland & Knight LLP 100 N. Tampa Street, Suite 4100			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
Tampa, FL 33602-3644		•	1765		
			DATE MAILED: 05/13/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	/
r	\sim

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/601,076	WESTERMAN ET AL.
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit
	Shamim Ahmed	1765
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	opears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPI THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a re - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the maili earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).		mely filed ys will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. ED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
Status		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19.	June 2003.	
<u> </u>	is action is non-final.	
3) Since this application is in condition for allows closed in accordance with the practice under		
Disposition of Claims		
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	awn from consideration.	
Application Papers		
9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examin 10) ☑ The drawing(s) filed on 19 June 2003 is/are: Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction of the oath or declaration is objected to by the Examination is objected to by the Examination is objected.	a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ objected to e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se ction is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ojected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119	•	
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documer 2. Certified copies of the priority documer 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documer application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. nts have been received in Applicat ority documents have been receive au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage
Attachment(s)		
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D	
 Notice of Draitsperson's Patent Drawing Review (P10-946) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>11/24/03</u>. 	F	Patent Application (PTO-152)

Application/Control Number: 10/601,076

Art Unit: 1765

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 2. Claims 1-10,12-18 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Hopkins et al (6,187,685).

Hopkins et al disclose a process of anisotropically etching a silicon substrate on an insulating layer of silicon oxide, wherein the substrate is subjected to an alternating cyclic process of etching and deposition process and also disclose the use of a pulsed RF bias voltage in conjunction with a high density plasma source (ICP) in order to reduce or eliminate notching (col.2, lines 28-43 and col.3, lines 3-6).

Hopkins et al also disclose in col.3, lines 31-39,

However, when the bias frequency is pulsed, the further etching and passivating step at a higher pressure is not necessary and therefore the process window is much wider, allowing higher mean etching rates as well as avoiding profile deterioration. Furthermore, in this embodiment end point detection is not necessary and a greatly improved notch width control over a much wider range of feature sizes is achieved. Indeed, the notching may be eliminated using this method.

As to claims 7-8,17-18, Hopkins et al disclose the bias voltage is pulsed by repetitive switching to on-off poistion during the "on" or "off" part of the power supply (ICP) (col.5, lines 54-59 and col.10, lines 14-20).

Application/Control Number: 10/601,076

Art Unit: 1765

As to claims 9-10, Hopkins et al teach that the bias frequency may be RF or DC and both the RF and DC bias voltage can be pulsed (col.2, lines 53-60).

As to claims 12 and 20, Hopkins et al teach that the charge and potential are maintained during a pulse cycle in such that charge build up does not reach a steady state (col.6, lines 36-51).

As to claim 13, Hopkins et al teach that the pulse width of 100 μ s to 5 ms, which reds on the claimed limitation of the pulse width is less than a few milliseconds (col.9, lines 43-44).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Application/Control Number: 10/601,076

Art Unit: 1765

5. Claims 11 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hopkins et al (6,187,685).

Hopkins et al discussed above in the paragraph 2 but remain silent about the introduction of the pulsing only when the insulation layer is exposed.

However, Hopkins et al disclose that the net result of excessive ion charging is localized etching of the silicon or "notching" at the insulation layer of oxide interface but not at the conductive layer interface, if the insulation layer is replaced by a conductive layer (col.1, lines 28-32).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of claimed invention would have been motivated to introduce pulsing only when the insulation layer is exposed for reducing "notching" during plasma etching because undesirable "notching" is observed only at the interface of the insulation layer (oxide layer or other dielectric) as taught by Hopkins et al.

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Bhardwaji et al (6,051,503) and Kaji et al (6,129,806) disclose plasma etching process, wherein etching and deposition occurs alternatively in a cyclic fashion with pulsing high energy source (ICP).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shamim Ahmed whose telephone number is (571) 272-1457. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Thu (7:00-5:30) Every Friday Off.

Art Unit: 1765

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nadine G Norton can be reached on (571) 272-1465. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Shamim Ahmed Examiner Art Unit 1765

SA May 4, 2004